















# False Reasons to Stop Rasterizing



- To get realistic lighting effects
  - The goal is information, not just effects
- To allow a simple unified model
  - Instead, choose the best technique per effect
- Ray-tracing is now fast enough
  - But rasterization is often a lot faster
  - Moore's law applies to both





### Memory Bandwidth



- Memory density and cost per bit have followed Moore's law
  - This & bin sort is why Sutherland was wrong: depth buffers became cheaper and faster
- Memory bandwidth per data pin hasn't
  - Wider data busses help, but not enough
  - Rasterization provides good memory locality for efficient caching & burst accesses

When Will Ray-Tracing Replace Rasterization



# GPUs/VPUs are Stream Processors, NOT CPUs



- Both are general purpose, but...
- GPU: Massive SIMD parallelism
  - SIMD-like conditionals (MIMD is costly)
- GPU: Streaming reads and writes
  - GPU: 5x CPU latency on memory-to-memory
  - >20x latency on load A0/store A1/load A1
  - Coherency is inherently very costly



When Will Ray-Tracing Replace Rasterization

## Algorithmic Advantages



- Efficient depth culling on pixels
  - Hierarchical depth tests save shading work
  - Can occlusion cull triangles as well
- Simple layering effects
  - Compute lighting and shadows separately
  - Compute an image, then use it as a texture
  - Ray-trace where appropriate

Aï

When Will Ray-Tracing Replace Rasterization?

# Future Directions • Anti-aliased lighting • See Jim Blinn's 1998 SIGGRAPH keynote • Surfels/splatting/randomized Z-buffer • Pfister (2000), Zwicker (2001), Wand (2001) • Eliminating unnecessary work • Jones, et. al. "Shader Maps" (2001 sketch) • Even more this year...





